

**From:** [PETERSON Jenn L](#)  
**To:** [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [rgensemer@parametrix.com](mailto:rgensemer@parametrix.com); [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [ANDERSON Jim M](#); [Robert.Neely@noaa.gov](mailto:Robert.Neely@noaa.gov)  
**Subject:** Bis(2-Ethylhexyl)phthalate TRV Review  
**Date:** 08/13/2008 04:25 PM

---

I took a quick look at the TRV memo for this chemical and was surprised when there were no studies identified for fish given there were studies identified by the LWG as a part of their TRV review (TRV Selection from the PRE, Sept. 9, 2005). The primary study identified was:

Mehrle and Mayer (1976), where a whole body tissue LOEC was calculated as 10.6 mg/kg ww BEHP from this paper. The NOEC was calculated as 0.39 mg/kg ww. I, too identified this reference and have requested it from the Oregon State Library. This memo does not calculate any value for bis, but if the LWG identified a recommended TRV why aren't we using it? They also identified two other papers, Tarr et al., 1990 and Wofford et al, 1981). They did not recommend these two papers because they didn't meet their criteria, but it would be good to verify with our own review. Were these looked at by the EPA team?

A bigger question I know have is whether or not we are using the LWG document as a reference for identifying papers and / or processes to develop TRVs. If not, we could be missing an important resource.

Also, why isn't Di(n)butyl phthalate included in the TRV process? Did it screen out?

-Jennifer